



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,770	09/04/2003	Oh Sung Kwon	930077-2003	8974
20999	7590	03/09/2005	EXAMINER	
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151				PHAM, TOAN NGOC
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2632		

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/656,770	KWON, OH SUNG
	Examiner Toan N Pham	Art Unit 2632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152).
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pease, Jr. et al. (US 5,311,168).

Regarding claim 1: Pease, Jr. et al. discloses an alarm lock set comprising a body (12), a locking device (18) installed in part of the body to lock and unlock an entrance door (13) and having a first handle (14) provided at an inner side of the entrance door, a lock assembly engaged with the first handle when a normal key is inserted, and a locking member actuated by rotation of the first handle; a first sensing device (34) which becomes an ON state as the locking member protrudes outside the locking device and an OFF state as the protruded locking member retreats; a speaker (36) generating alarm when the first sensing device senses an intruder, and a power portion (20) supplying electric power to the first sensing device and the speaker (col. 3, lines 22-45). Pease, Jr. et al. does not disclose the layout and location of the holes and the speaker; however, it is merely a matter of design choice to locate the holes and the speaker for the purpose of providing an alarm sound through the housing.

Regarding claim 2: Pease Jr. et al. does not disclose the rotational direction of the first handle; however, it is obvious that the deadbolt device of the door lock includes the directional rotation to lock and unlock the door.

Regarding claim 3: Pease, Jr. et al. discloses the motion sensor (34) (col. 3, lines 50-53); thus, it is obvious that motion sensors are infrared sensor that detects the intruder's body heat.

Regarding claim 6: Pease, Jr. et al. does not disclose the tact switch; however, Pease, Jr. et al. disclose the sensor (34) for sensing unauthorized tampering of the door lock; therefore, it is merely a matter of design choice to disclose different sensor to detect the tampering of the door lock.

Regarding claim 8: Pease, Jr. et al. discloses the switch (14) for turning on and off the sensing device and provided the sensing device (Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 9: Pease, Jr. et al. does not disclose the main handle used to open and shut the entrance door; however, it is obvious and well known that the entrance door of any home includes the main handle or knob to open and shut the door.

Regarding claim 11: Pease, Jr. et al. does not disclose the main handle used to open and shut the entrance door; however, it is obvious and well known that the entrance door of any home includes the main handle or knob to open and shut the door.

Claims 4, 5, 7 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pease, Jr. et al. (US 5,311,168) in view of Keely et al. (US 4,970,494).

Regarding claim 4: Pease, Jr. et al. does not disclose the remote controller, Keely et al. discloses the unit (16) which includes the remote controller (50) that is responsive to the remote transmitter (34) for activating the door alarm system (Figs. 1, 2). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the remote controller as taught by Keely et al. in a system as disclosed by Pease, Jr. et al. for providing a more convenient wireless control system.

Regarding claim 5: Keely et al. discloses the second sensing device (36) remote from the remote controller (Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 7: Pease, Jr. et al. does not disclose the tact switch; however, Pease, Jr. et al. disclose the sensor (34) for sensing unauthorized tampering of the door lock; therefore, it is merely a matter of design choice to disclose different sensor to detect the tampering of the door lock.

Regarding claim 10: Pease, Jr. et al. does not disclose the main handle used to open and shut the entrance door; however, it is obvious and well known that the entrance door of any home includes the main handle or knob to open and shut the door.

Regarding claim 12: Keely et al. discloses the second sensor (36) being installed or mounted on the wall (col. 2, lines 55-56).

Regarding claim 13: Pease, Jr. et al. discloses the alarm light portion (32) (col. 4, lines 53-65).

Regarding claim 14: Pease, Jr. et al. discloses an alarm lock set comprising a body (12), a locking device (18) installed in part of the body to lock and unlock an entrance door (13) and having a first handle (14) provided at an inner side of the

entrance door, a lock assembly engaged with the first handle when a normal key is inserted, and a locking member actuated by rotation of the first handle; a first sensing device (34) which becomes an ON state as the locking member protrudes outside the locking device and an OFF state as the protruded locking member retreats; a speaker (36) generating alarm when the first sensing device senses an intruder, and a power portion (20) supplying electric power to the first sensing device and the speaker (col. 3, lines 22-45). Pease, Jr. et al. does not disclose the layout and location of the holes and the speaker; however, it is merely a matter of design choice to locate the holes and the speaker for the purpose of providing an alarm sound through the housing. Pease, Jr. et al. does not disclose the remote controller, Keely et al. discloses the unit (16) which includes the remote controller (50) that is responsive to the remote transmitter (34) for activating the door alarm system (Figs. 1, 2). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the remote controller as taught by Keely et al. in a system as disclosed by Pease, Jr. et al. for providing a more convenient wireless control system.

Regarding claim 15: Pease, Jr. et al. discloses the alarm light portion (32) (col. 4, lines 53-65).

Regarding claim 16: Pease, Jr. et al. does not disclose the main handle used to open and shut the entrance door; however, it is obvious and well known that the entrance door of any home includes the main handle or knob to open and shut the door.

Regarding claim 17: Pease, Jr. et al. does not disclose the main handle used to open and shut the entrance door; however, it is obvious and well known that the entrance door of any home includes the main handle or knob to open and shut the door.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art of Agozzino (US 6,020,816), Ferrantelli (US 5,754,107), Heiland (US 4,360,803), and Soloway et al. (US 6,812,836) are cited to show a variety of door lock alarm systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Toan N Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-2967. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel J Wu can be reached on (571) 272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TOAN N. PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER


3/4/05